



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/615,844	07/13/2000	Takahiro Mizuguchi	S0255.0003/P003	6780
24998	7590	02/03/2004	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 2101 L STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20037-1526			LEE, GRACE C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	
DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/615,844	MIZUGUCHI, TAKAHIRO
	Examiner Grace C. Lee	Art Unit 2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5 & 8</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 18, the phrase "such as" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al (US Patent 6,012,083, "Savitzky" hereinafter) in view of Rautila et al. (US patent 6,549,625, "Rautila" hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Savitzky discloses an information input-output device comprising:

- a service provision unit which has a database relating to services that can be provided to a subscriber, and verifies whether a person trying to access the database is a subscriber who can be provided with the variety of services (col 5, line 1-3, web server is service provision unit; Fig 1, Item 14 Server);
- an input-output control unit which receives data from said service provision unit and outputs the data, wherein data in the database is read out through operation from said input-output control unit (col 5, line 19-22; agency is input-output control unit; Fig 1, Item 10 agency)

Savitzky fails to teach authentication code is entered into said input-output control unit from which the data is desired to be output. Rautila teaches the information transmitted from the transceiver to the database may be signed by the user to permit database verification, the database transmits the stored

information associated with the identification information with the network to the second transceiver (col 5, line 39-51) in an analogous art for the purpose of having the database checks validity of the signature prior to the information is provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to include entering an authentication code into input-output control unit to have the user authenticated prior to the service can be provided in Savitzky's information input-output device.

Regarding claims 2-4, Savitzky's discloses a web browser can display documents for viewing (text, graphics, or video documents) or listening (audio document) (col 1, line 36-38) to meet the limitations of claims 2-4, the data is relating to a newspaper or a publication, sound source data, static image data and moving picture data.

Regarding claim 5, Savitzky discloses an information input-output device comprising:

- a plurality of input-output control units which allow data captured by a data input device to be entered, and allow the data captured inside the device to be output onto a data output device (col 3, line 44-57; agent is input-output device);

Savitzky fails to teach authentication code is entered into said input-output control unit from which the data is desired to be output and fail to teach a verification unit that verifies whether the user is allowed to handle communications between a plurality of input-output units. Rautila teaches the information transmitted from the transceiver to the database may be signed by the user to permit database verification, the database transmits the stored information associated with the identification information with the network to the second transceiver (col 5, line 39-51) in an analogous art for the purpose of having the database checks validity of the signature prior to the information is provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to include entering an authentication code into input-output control unit to have the user authenticated and to verify the user is allowed to handle communications between a plurality of input-output units prior to the service can be provided in Savitzky's information input-output device.

Regarding claims 6-8, these claims with same limitations as per claims 2-4 and are rejected as per claims 2-4.

Regarding claims 9 & 13, Savitzky discloses an information input-output system comprising:

- a mobile communication terminal (Fig 1, item 12 client);

- a service provision unit which performs communications with said terminal over a radio transmission line, has a database relating to services that can be provided to a user of said terminal, and verifies whether said user is a subscriber who can be provided with the variety of services (Fig 1, Item 14 server);
- an input-output control unit which receives data from said service provision unit over an established line and outputs the data, wherein communication between said terminal and said service provision unit is established, and then data in the database is read out through operation from said terminal (Fig 1, item 10 agency);

Savitzky fails to teach authentication code is entered into said input-output control unit from which the data is desired to be output. Rautila teaches the information transmitted from the transceiver to the database may be signed by the user to permit database verification, the database transmits the stored information associated with the identification information with the network to the second transceiver (col 5, line 39-51) in an analogous art for the purpose of having the database checks validity of the signature prior to the information is provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to include entering an authentication code into input-output control unit to have the user authenticated prior to the service can be provided in Savitzky's information input-output system.

Regarding claim 10, Savitzky discloses the user simply sends a request for document to printer agency and the "Print" button contains a tag which will cause printer agency to send the document to printer (col 13, line 2-11). Savitzky fails to teach the user is authenticated prior to output command is entered. Rautila teaches the information transmitted from the transceiver to the database may be signed by the user to permit database verification, the database transmits the stored information associated with the identification information with the network to the second transceiver (col 5, line 39-51) in an analogous art for the purpose of having the database checks validity of the signature prior to the information is provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to add authenticating a user prior to the service of outputting the data is provided.

Regarding claim 12, Savitzky discloses printer agency might handle additional configuration tasks such as having the user select a printer by presenting the user with a Web page showing printer locations and includes a clickable map of the printers (col 13, line 25-28) to meet the limitation of claim 12.

Regarding claims 14,16, these claims with same limitations as per claims 10,12 and are rejected as per claims 10,12

Regarding claim 17, Savitzky discloses a mobile communication terminal through which an command is input into an input-output control unit. Savitzky fails to teach

through which an authentication code used for user authentication is input into an input-output control unit, from which data is desired to be output, over a radio transmission line or by an established cable. Rautila teaches the information transmitted from the transceiver to the database may be signed by the user to permit database verification, the database transmits the stored information associated with the identification information with the network to the second transceiver (col 5, line 39-51) in an analogous art for the purpose of having the database checks validity of the signature prior to the information is provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to include entering an authentication code into a mobile communication terminal unit to have the user authenticated prior to the service can be provided in Savitzky's mobile communication terminal.

4. Claims 11, 15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky et al (US Patent 6,012,083, "Savitzky" hereinafter) in view of Rautila et al. (US patent 6,549,625, "Rautila" hereinafter) as applied to claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-17 above, and further in view of Van Rijn (US Patent 6,574,604).

Regarding claim 11, as applied to claim 10 above, Savitzky in view of Rautila discloses an input-output control unit receives the data when an output command is input after the user is authenticated and then outputs the data. Rautila teaches an input-output control unit providing receiving data and outputting data service including the acknowledgement of payment to the user of the mobile terminal and access location

based device or specialized service or to machine providing the purchased goods or receiver (col 7, line 8-11). Savitzky in view of Rautila fails to teach the charging is settled by using any device such as a cash collection device. Van Rijn discloses the internet message system is activated by a payment system suitable examples of which include a cash device, similar to that of conventional vending machines that receive bills and coins, a pre-paid card device which is capable of receiving and translating fees from pre-paid cards such as telephone cards, a payment card (e.g. credit card or bank card) device, such as those that allow the user to slide his/her card through a magnetic strip reader, and combinations (col 5, line 17-21) for the purpose of receiving the payment of service provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to include a cash collection device in the Savitzky in view of Rautila's information input-output system to collect the payment for the service provided.

Regarding claim 15, this claim with same limitations as per claim 11 and is rejected as per claim 11.

Regarding claim 18, Savitzky in view of Rautila discloses an input-output control unit which receives data from a mobile communication terminal when an output command is input (col 13, line 2-11). Savitzky in view of Rautila fails to teach at the same time starts the settlement of charging by using any device such as a cash collection device into which a specified amount of cash is previously inserted, or electronic cash such as an

IC card or a magnetic card. Van Rijn discloses the internet message system is activated by a payment system suitable examples of which include a cash device, similar to that of conventional vending machines that receive bills and coins, a pre-paid card device which is capable of receiving and translating fees from pre-paid cards such as telephone cards, a payment card (e.g. credit card or bank card) device, such as those that allow the user to slide his/her card through a magnetic strip reader, and combinations (col 5, line 17-21) for the purpose of receiving the payment of service provided. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to include a cash collection device in the Savitzky in view of Rautila's input-output control unit to collect the payment for the service provided.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grace C. Lee whose telephone number is 703-305-0710. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 703-305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Application/Control Number: 09/615,844
Art Unit: 2132

Page 11

Grace C. Lee
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

GCL
January 28, 2004

Gilberto B. ✓
GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100